DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 346 SP 030 537

AUTHOR Campbell, Charles R.
TITLE Assessing the Impact of Major Intercollegiate Sports Programs on Arizona State University at Tempe, and Developing a Solution Strategy. Societal Factors Affecting Education.
PUB DATE Feb 87
NOTE 44p.; Ed.D. Practicum Paper, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *College Athletics; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Institutional Evaluation; *Institutional Mission; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; School Policy; *Social Values; Team Sports
IDENTIFIERS *Arizona State University Tempe

ABSTRACT

This practicum evaluated the impact which Arizona State University (ASU) at Tempe's sports operation had on the university's ability to carry out its mission of education and research. Information was collected from library research on sports operations and educational institutions in general, and on the sports program at ASU. Personal interviews were conducted with the principal administrators of the university. This material was presented in the context of six situation audits highlighting the university's internal strengths and weaknesses as well as its external opportunities and threats. General findings from this analysis were: (1) there was an overemphasis on money and winning; (2) academically unqualified students were enrolled at the university; and (3) the university was not doing all that could be done to make sure that sports did not conflict with its mission. Recommendations are presented in the form of guidelines for action emphasizing the maintenance of a sports environment which recognizes and supports the concept of academic excellence. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300346

ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF MAJOR INTERCOLLEGIATE SPORTS PROGRAMS ON ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY AT TEMPE, AND DEVELOPING A SOLUTION STRATEGY

SOCIETAL FACTORS AFFECTING EDUCATION

By
Charles R. Campbell, M.P.A.
Arizona State University
at Tempe

CLUSTER COORDINATOR, Dr. Raul Cardenas
CLUSTER, Phoenix

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

February 1987

SP 032 537

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. R. Campbell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PRACTICUM PROPOSAL CHECK SHEET

1. Name of Student: Charles R. Campbell

   Cluster: Phoenix Date: September 1986

2. Job Title: Coordinator Environmental Health, ASU

3. Title of the Practicum: Assessing the Impact of Major Intercollegiate Sports on Arizona State University at - Tempe, and Developing a Solution Strategy

4. What change in the institution or organization is proposed? It is anticipated that the conduct of the practicum will enhance the ability of the university to effectively address significant societal changes

5. Where will the practicum be carried out?

   Institution: Airzona State University

   Department: University administration

6. Does the design contain criteria for measuring the results of the practicum? Yes

7. What are the required inputs:

   a. Estimated number of hours to complete the practicum, and by whom? 150 hours by student

   b. Are needed facilities and other means available: Yes
      If the performance of the practicum required prior approval from a superior, has such approval been secured? Yes

   c. When (date) will the practicum be started and when (date is it expected to end? September-November 1986

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this practicum was to evaluate the impact which Arizona State University at Tempe's sports operation had on the university's ability to carry out its mission of education and research.

The solution strategy followed in this practicum involved three procedures. First, information was collected from library research on sports operations and educational institutions in general and then on specific sports programs at Arizona State University. Secondly, personal interviews were conducted with the principal administrators of the university. Finally, this material was presented in the context of a situation audit using a SWOT format highlighting the university's internal strengths and weaknesses as well as its external opportunities and threats.

The general findings that emerged from this analysis were: (1) there was an overemphasis on money and winning, (2) academically unqualified students were enrolled at the university, and (3) Arizona State University was not doing all that could be done to make sure that sports did not conflict with the university's mission.

Based upon the findings, recommendations were

presented in the form of guidelines for action emphasizing the maintenance of a sports environment which recognizes and supports the concept of academic excellence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF TABLESS	v
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	4
Introduction	4
Sports Operations at Arizona State University at Tempe	5
Sports Operations at Institutions of Higher Learning	9
3. PROCEDURES	12
4. RESULTS	15
Opportunities	15
Threats	17
Strengths	19
Weaknesses	22
5. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	25
Discussion	25
Implications	27
Recommendations	28
APPENDIX - Interview Questionnaire	33
BIBLIOGRAPHY	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Arizona State University Sports Revenues 1975-1980	20
2.	SWOT Analysis Arizona State University Sports Program	24

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

According to an institutional societal factors inventory (ISFI) conducted at Arizona State University at Tempe in 1985--approximately one hundred years after the founding of the college in 1885--there are five major societal factors potentially significant in terms of their ability for impact upon the university as an institution with the primary mission of education and research. One of the identified factors was the effect of major collegiate sports operations. The impact of this factor is especailly relevant for Arizona State as the opening of this decade witnessed the university's involvement in a major scandal involving payoffs to athletes, falsification of academic transcripts, and other fraudulent practices (New York Times, August 17, 1980).

This project was an evaluation of the probable impact of Arizona State's sports operation on its ability to carry out its mission of education and research. The evaluation was conducted using both library and interview data collected from principal university administrators. The aim of this evaluation was to answer the following research questions:

1. What factors external to the university have

created favorable situations with respect to the impact of the collegiate sports operation on the university's mission of education and research; i.e., to what extent has revenue derived from sports programs enabled the university to conduct programs more in-line with the institutional objectives of education and research?

2. What factors external to the university have created unfavorable situations with respect to the impact of the collegiate sports operations on the university's mission; i.e., has scandal involving the athletics program resulted in qualified high school seniors deciding against enrolling at the university?

3. What internal resources or capacities of the university might operate as strengths facilitating the achievement of the university's mission and how might they be related to the impact of sports operation?

4. What internal resources or capacities of the university might operate as weaknesses detracting from or obstructing the university's mission, and how might these be related to the impact of sports operation?

On the basis of data collected to answer the foregoing questions, a qualitative analysis was conducted with the aim of formulating a strategy by which the university might shape the impact of sports operations along lines maximizing its mission of education and

research. It should be noted that this type of analysis has been termed by Rowe, Mason, and Dickel (1985) as a situation audit. This audit, it should be further noted, was conducted in the context of a SWOT analysis which involved application to the research problem data related to the university's internal strengths and weaknesses as well as to its external opportunities and threats.

Chapter 2

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Introduction

This investigation of the impact of the societal factors of Arizona State University at Tempe's major collegiate sports operations on the university's mission of education and research is expressly related to the basic concepts discussed in the seminar, "Societal Factors Affecting Education" as those concepts relate to both internal and external environmental factors pressuring an institution toward a certain structure and mode of operation. With respect to the asssessment of impact, it is to be noted that serving as background data to the interview data collected in this project (from principal university administrators) and highlighting the significance of the undertaken research problem, are a host of articles written about the operation of university sports programs in general as well as the situation at Arizona State in particular. So that the relevance of these data may be fully drawn, the focus begins with a delineation of the problems and attendant publicity Arizona State's sports program has faced since the beginning of the 1980s. Once the situation at Arizona State is fully explicated, it is related to literature

discussing the general situation of sports programs at colleges and universities of higher learning.

Sports Operations at Arizona State University at Tempe

On August 17, 1980, New York Times sports writer Gordon S. White reported the results of the Pac-10 conference conducted to resolve a scandal involving a number of fraudulent procedures on the part of several of its member schools. Among the charges considered were: payoffs to players, falsification of records aimed at maintaining player elligibility, and fraudulent classroom practices toward this same goal.

Voting unanimously, the presidents and chancellors barred half of its member football teams from playing in winter bowl games. Among the penalized institutions declared ineligible for the 1980 conference championship was Arizona State University whose former head coach, Tony Mason, was scheduled for trial on November 12 for defrauding the state of Arizona by falsifying travel vouchers. Also investigating the charges levied against Pac-10 members was The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). And Frank Kush, who had replaced Mason and was dismissed by Arizona State just days before the scandal broke, was under investigation by the NCAA and Pac-10 members.

A previous attempt to stop transcript falsification

had been undertaken by Pac-10 in which students were barred from receiving extension or makeup course credit; however, the scandal made the uselessness of this policy clear. Nonetheless, the NCAA decided to incorporate this rule into policy as part of its "crack-down" or records falsification.

In terms of the scandal itself, White reported that officials claimed it to be the result of trying to keep academically unqualified athletes in college sports programs because while they might be bad students, they are very good players. These officials saw the truly effective move against falsification of transcripts to be setting higher standards for academic entrance by athletes--standards which currently require no higher than a C-average.

Also noted by White is that none of the penalties levied against the schools affected their television money. As White put it:

> Despite the penalties against the five Pacific 10 schools, there are no financial sanctions involved. None of the teams is prohibited from appearing on a television game of the week during the 1980 regular season; such an appearance is worth over $200,000 to a team. Further, the penalty does not prevent the schools from sharing in bowl revenue.

The article goes on to note that in the previous year, television monies yielded approximately $190,000 for each team in the Pac-10 league.

What is to be noted in the just delineated article is

that (1) serious legal violations appeared to occur in Arizona State sports operations, (2) the penalties forthcoming by authoritative bodies (Pac-10 and the NCAA) in no way affected the monies accruing from said operations, and (3) according to some officials, penalties did not apear to be effective in terms of dealing with those source factors that produced the violations, namely poor academic performance on the part of athletes.

Further insight into the Arizona situation is provided in a series of follow-up articles written in the New York Times during 1981. According to these articles, those events involved in violations at Arizona State University were:

1. In-fighting related to players and players' parents (January 27, 1981).

2. Attempts to cover up violations (January 27, 1981).

3. Willingness of other colleges to hire dismissed personnel involved in fraudulent efforts so long as said personnel were associated with winning teams (February 5, 1981).

On March 29, 1981, Neil Amdur suggested in an article written for the New York Times that yet another factor involved in sports operations and violations of legality involving Arizona State University was its booster club. In this regard, Amdur noted that the Arizona attorney

general's office had completed a six-month long investigation of Arizona State University's Sun Angel Foundation and its spinoff organization, the Legna Foundation. The attorney general's concern involved the mishandling of 12,866 football tickets which booster clubs often control in order to finance their activities. Moreover, there were rumors that the club had tried to protect, via a cover-up, coach Frank Kush's involvement in a sideline fight with a player. Indeed, the attorney general's sources claimed that the president of the Foundation had not only tried to retain the dismissed coach through withholding of funds aimed at expanding the football stadium, he had also attempted as an appeasement move to get the director of athletics dismissed instead of the coach involved in the rumored fight. While booster clubs vary in structure and size from university to university, Amdur reported that the Sun Angel Foundation wielded enormous power as its membership was large and included several prominent bankers, lawyers and politicians.

When efforts to save Kush fell through, it was found that Sun Angel Foundation had set up a retirement fund for Coach Kush with a portfolio value of $120,000 and payments scheduled to begin in two years. This decision came after Arizona State University had received a two-year probation by the NCAA in January for the aformentioned violations, one of which included a $40,000 cash payment to Kush by

several independent boosters. The payment had been made several years prior to retain Kush at Arizona State after it had been reported that he was seeking another job.

The scandal at Arizona State University, to be fully understood, must be reviewed in the light of general sports operation programs at major universities. Thus, to add context to what is presented here by way of background, the next section of this review examines the literature on sports operations in general.

Sports Operations at Institutions of Higher Learning

One discussion of sports operations' general costs to education is provided by Carter Murphy in the December 12, 1986 edition of the Los Angeles Times--Murphy is a profesor of economics at Southern Methodist University (SMU). Noting that SMU had recently faced charges of NCAA violations involving recruiting practices, he suggested that most universities have been diverted from their primary objectives of teaching and research by several forces. These forces can be delineated as follows:

1. Alumni, now monied and powerful, whose nostalgia for Saturday afternoon games lead them to idealize this practice as somehow the epitome of college life; thus making sports operations a way of holding on to their adolescent memories and identities.

2. The marketing value offered by television in terms of publicity for college enrollment in general.

3. Hopes of players for high paying sports jobs after they leave college.

4. Profits accruing to the colleges for winning and the fact that losses lead to reduced college revenue which leads faculty to spend as much time with academically unqualified players as with honor students.

In another sports article written by John Nelson for the December 21, 1986 edition of the Los Angeles Times, the NCAA itself is charged with being part of the problem. Nelson noted that the organization utilizes a flawed system of investigation and is not especially communicative about that system with university and college officials. Specifically, Nelson charges that the NCAA's secretiveness creates an atmosphere of fear and mistrust, that the organization disregards due process rights, fails to watchdog its own investigators and lacks clarity in policy stipulations as well as the fact that investigators sometimes stiffen penalties out of personal spite and vindictiveness against some of the people thay have been dealing with during the course of the investigation.

Also relevant to the general picture of sports operation and education is the phenomenon of the booster club. In general, most universities use booster funds for

student-athlete scholarships, new sports facilities, and coaching inducements. The dependence of the college on these funds means that the booster club has potential for great power over college sports operations. And according to Neil Amdur (New York Times, March 29, 1981), most of these organizations are taking full advantage of this power, a fact manifesting itself in the increasing involvement of booster clubs in NCAA violations. Amdur also noted that the booster clubs are often assisted in these violations by coaches.

As can be seen from the foregoing, the situation at Arizona State University is not atypical of the situation at most colleges and universities emphasizing and relying on their sports programs as a revenue source. This fact highlights the size of the research problem in that if collected data can lead to: (1) an assessment of the general impact of sports operations on Arizona State University's mission and (2) formulation of policy for handling this impact, it becomes probable that many universities and colleges across the country can use these data in assessing their own program and in formulating policy to deal with problems in their programs.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES

The undertaken investigation utilized library and interview data in an effort to assess the probable impact of Arizona State's sports operation program with respect to the university's mission of education and research, and--based upon this assessment--to formulate a strategy for dealing with this impact. To this end, several methods and procedures were involved in the collection and analysis of data.

The first procedure involved library research investigating the literature bearing upon sports operations at institutions of higher learning in general and Arizona State University in particular. This research yielded the background information discussed in the previous chapter.

The second procedure involved conducting personal, loosely structured interviews with the principal administrators of the university. During the course of these interviews, administrators were asked to state their general opinion of the major intercollegiate sports programs conducted at the university as well as their reasons for holding these opinions. They were further asked to state university weaknesses and strengths as well

as both those opportunities and threats to the university which derived from the external environment as contributors to the college's sports operations. Finally, they were asked to assess whether the shool's sports opeartion programs were assets to the college as well as the reasons upon which the assessment was based.

The third procedure was to integrate administrators' responses with the existing literature in order to provide a qualitative assessment of the probable impact of the university's sports operation programs on the university's mission of education and research. This assessment is presented in Chapter 4 of this study.

The overall assessment was performed within the context of a SWOT analysis, SWOT being an acronym for strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. Each of these terms was defined, for the purposes of this assessment, as follows:

1. Opportunities. Favorable situations created by factors external to the university environment that operate to foster the mission of education and research within the context of its sports operation programs.

2. Threats. Unfavorable situations created by factors external to the university environment that operate to obstruct or detract from the mission of education and research.

3. Strengths. Internal Arizona State University resources and capabilities that foster the mission of education and research within the context of the university's sports operation programs.

4. Weaknesses. Internal Arizona State University resources and capabilities that detract from the mission of education and research within the context of the university's sports operation programs.

The primary assumption of the study is that the data contributed by administrators is valid in so far as the fact that administrators' perceptions are accurate and reliable reflections of the true situation at Arizona State University. A secondary assumption is methodological. This assumption is that the qualitative approach in general and the SWOT analysis approach in particular is a means of accurately assessing the impact of Arizona State University's sports operation programs on the university's mission of education and research.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

Opportunities

Based on the existing literature and the responses of Arizona State University principal administrators, it was concluded that there are a number of factors external to the university environment that operate to foster its mission within the context of its sports operation program. These factors can be delineated as follows:

1. There are a number of alumni who not only support, via their time and money, sports operations at Arizona State University but who are also concerned with bolstering the academic performance of players. These individuals assist both sports and education efforts in the form of contributing monies to scholarship funds for athletes. They also contribute to efforts related to tutoring projects. They discuss with administrators ways in which players' time outside of practice may be most profitably spent with respect to learning their academic subjects.

2. A second factor external to the university environment operating to create situations favorable to the

university's mission within the context of its sports operations concerns funding for non sports-related programs. There are a number of people (both alumni and non-alumni) who view the keen competitiveness and superior performances of Arizona State University's athletes as reflections of the overall soundness of the institution in general--this is not difficult to understand given the prominent value Americans place on sports in terms of character and citizenship building. Because they are convinced that a sound program of athletics means sound programs in non-athletic fields, these individuals select Arizona State University over other colleges when it comes to enrollment and/or contributing funds for non sports-related programs.

3. Related to the foregoing is the external factor of media. Any institution profits from favorable publicity, be this publicity aimed at sports or non sports-related events. By covering Arizona State University sports operations, television enables a positive image of the university to be disseminated to a large audience of people which in turn operates to attract a certain subset of these people to enroll and/or contribute money to the university in general. To the extent that those enrolling are highly qualified, this process can also operate to elevate the school's overall academic standing.

Threats

Many of the factors deriving from the external environment to create favorable situations are, in fact, double-edged swords also operating to create unfavorable situations. This can be seen from a review of those threats to the university's mission deriving from the external environment within the context of sports operation. Based on an integration of the existing literature and Arizona State University administrators' responses, these factors may be delineated as follows:

1. Alumni so overzealous in their enthusiasm for sports that they lose sight of the university's mission and/or view this mission as somehow secondary to winning in sports are a decided threat. It should be noted here that as pointed out by a number of administrators these alumni are often not money oriented persay; that is, they are not as depicted by many articles viewing sports events as a business and thereby pushing to win for this reason. Rather, they are fixated on winning which they view as a symbol for a variety of psychological and social values such as the maintenance of youth or the manifestation and triumph of the American Way. These alumni members are a threat because their behavior will not be directed toward those activities that foster the mission of the university and may even at times lead to activities which detract from the mission of the university; i.e. such as pushing for the

enrollment of players who are not academically qualified to attend a university or the pressuring of certain university members to change failing grades of athletes.

2. The university's mission is also threatened by those individuals external to the environment who are concerned with money more so than either sports or education. For example, some promoters working for professional sports often view any sports, even those played in a college situation as merely another aspect of the business of sports. Such people want to see the best players at colleges and so watch them develop over the years and sometimes they are willing to work toward, or to pressure, colleges and universities to maintain academically unqualified players.

3. The media, as noted earlier, can create favorable publicity for a university like Arizona State; however, it can also operate as a threat when coverage is unfavorable. When shown in a negative light in the media, the university can lose in terms of students deciding against enrollment and others deciding not to fund either sports-related or non sports-related activities.

4. Two administrators also cited the NCAA's tactics as threatening to the university's mission. They note that frequently the NCAA uses investigative tactics subject to serious question. They then levy fines and penalties based

on those spurious investigations and thus are not only behaving unfairly with the school and the players but also contributing to extremely unfavorable publicity which, in turn, contributes to revenue loss and enrollment decline. One administrator felt that it was imperative for Arizona State University to work harder toward getting the NCAA to behave more equitably in its investigations.

Strengths

1. The major strength of any well-run, winning sports program at Arizona State University, or any other college, is that these programs bring rather large sums of money which the school can use for all of its activities including those more in-line with its mission than sports persay. All administrators interviewed cited the resource of a winning sports program as a strength. Their point is made even stronger when one examines the revenue brought in by Arizona State University sports. For example, the following statistics, as highlighted in Table 1 on the following page, may be considered. In 1975, Arizona State University's intercollegiate athletics brought in revenue of $317,892 over expenditures. In 1976, revenue over expenditures reached a value of $196,643. In 1977, revenue over expenditures was $331,445; in 1978, revenue over expenditures was $281,601; and in 1979, revenue over expenditures was a whopping figure of $614,177. In 1980, however, the year of the scandal, expenditures equalled

Table 1

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY SPORTS REVENUES

1975 - 1980

Year	Revenue Over Expenditure
1975	$ 317,892
1976	$ 196,643
1977	$ 331,445
1978	$ 281,601
1979	$ 614,177
1980	$ 0

revenue. This final statistic highlights the negative influence of bad publicity in terms of money loss to the school.

2. ,Another major strength of Arizona State University's well-run and winning sports program is its power to attract the most knowledgable coaches and other faculty involved in the athletics department. The university's mission of education and research means that faculty departments should strive to maximize the knowledge of their faculty and staff thereby elevating the school's overall academic soundness and its ability to teach. Thus, such sports programs increase the general ability of the university to teach and instruct by ensuring that the athletic department faculty maintains high academic qualifications.

3. As noted in the literature, booster clubs can operate to assist a university with funding; and sports operations have as one of their potentials the power to attract boosters. A good booster club can greatly contribute to the sports operation program in terms of multiple benefits to faculty, players, and the university. a fact which can elevate the program's power to attract winning players and thereby increase the university's overall revenue.

Also, it should be noted that even though booster organizations have been involved in a number of scandals

involving NCAA violations, there is really no reason to believe that a university can not stop its booster organizations from such violations. The point was made by several administrators who felt that the key to controlling booster organizations was that the university insist on integrity from the start and go out of its way to attract boosters who are men and women high in personal integrity.

Also noted by a few administrators and a point not to be ignored was that the university can assist boosters away from so overemphasizing sports that they lose clarity with respect to ethics and legalities--and thereby involve the school in negative publicity and thus detract from the mission which is supported by favorable publicity in the form of increased revenue and enrollment of academically qualified students--is to remind the boosters in some constant manner of the university's primary mission. In other words, boosters must be made to see that the university values its sports operation program because of the programs' ability to elevate the overall education most students receive and research efforts aimed at increasing human knowledge. Perhaps what is being recommended here is a little "education" for boosters in terms of university objectives.

Weaknesses

Those factors internal to Arizona State University which can operate to detract from its mission can be listed

as follows:

1. Involvement of faculty and students in the evaluation of sports and winning and/or money over the school's mission stands as a weakness to said mission. America is a country which idealizes winning and endows the wealthy with a glamour and respectibility solely related to earning capacity. These two societal or cultural factors can operate to make faculty and players unconcerned with sports operation as a reflection of the university's mission which is education and research. Rather, all that is important is winning (either because of some ideological-psychologcial connection such as maintaining adolescent identities, manifesting American triumph, or else simply the love of the material and winning means money). To the extent that Arizona State University has such players, students, and faculty members within its organization, it has an internal, inherent weakness detracting from its mission. Some may think: Well, this is not really a weakness since it is such people who push to win and thereby assist the school in earning revenues. But this push to win can lead to violations of rules which when discovered lead to bad publicity and money loss.

2. The overemphasis on money and winning can also lead to enrolling and keeping highly unqualified students simply because they are good players and this is also incompatible with the university's mission.

Table 2

SWOT ANALYSIS

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY SPORTS PROGRAM

Opportunities	Threats
1. Support of athletic programs.	1. Overzealous alumni
2. Support for non sports-related programs	2. Sports as a business
3. Favorable media publicity	3. Unfavorable media publicity
	4. NCAA investigative tactics
Strengths	**Weaknesses**
1. Increased revenues	1. Sports, winning, & money over education
2. Attract qualified faculty	2. Enrollment of unqualified students
3. Good booster club	

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

In his article for the December 12, 1986 edition of the Los Angeles Times, J. Carter Murphy advocated colleges and universities attempting to de-emphasize or even completely eschew big money sports as being antipathetical to the mission of teaching and research. The question here is: Does the SWOT analysis conducted for this study yield findings supporting Murphy's view?

The answer is not necessarily. Clearly, there are major factors operating to force the university's focus more on winning sports games than on educating students. But just as clearly there exist numerous factors derived from or involving sports which assist in the university's mission; i.e., the benefits in terms of revenue, the benefits in terms of highly academically qualified student enrollment, the benefits in terms of attracting funding for more academic activities, and the benefits in attracting and retaining soundly qualified faculty in the athletics and physical education departments. Moreover, the findings of this study do not support the notion that desiring to win in university

sports games must necessarily involve putting education and research secondary to this pursuit.

However, the picture that does emerge from this project's findings is that Arizona State University is simply not doing all that can be done to make sure that sports and winning sports games does not conflict with the university's mission. For example, many of the charges levied against the university have involved falsification of athletes' academic records. While Pac-10 and even the NCAA took some direct action, Arizona State University directly did not do all that it could do. What was needed in this regard was a complete reevaluation of enrollment qualifications.

If players whose academic capability has been demonstrated prior to attending school are all that are allowed to enroll at Arizona State, the worry over records falsification can be lessened simply because there will be less need for anyone to engage in such practices. However, so long as any university is unwilling to take a possible loss of revenue as a result of only accepting the academically sound, it leaves itself open both within and without to all individuals viewing winning in sports as a more important university goal than education and research. Thus, if it is impossible for the universities themselves to set rigorous policy aimed at maintaining their mission despite at least initial revenue loss, it can be said that sports operation is antipathetical to the

university's mission. But, in fact, this is not the case. What is the case is that the university itself has redefined its mission as reducible to funding from sports revenue.

Implications

The single most important implication of this study's findings is that most probably as currently practiced, steps taken to maximize Arizona State University's mission within the context of sports operation will mean some loss of revenue. This is because as currently practiced, winning in college sports is not strongly related to selecting students from the limited population of persons operating at at least normative college performance. In professional sports, nobody cares if a player can perform academically--nor should they as the focus is solely on athletic ability. But this is not the case in college sports. College sports are suppose to reflect the athletic performance of scholars. However, because such an emphasis has been placed upon winning, scholarship has been given only a secondary concern and even here it is only a worry because of the fact that players must give some evidence of said scholarship in order to play. Obviously, if winning is all, then widening the population of potential players is a good strategy but if education is the primary mission of the school, the strategy is not useful.

What the foregoing means is that if the school's

mission is to be given preeminance then colleges such as Arizona State University as well as faculty, staff, students, promoters, recruiters, players, boosters, etc. must be made to realize that unlike professional sports where the concern is solely on athletic performance, college sports also involves academic performance. What is interesting here is that once a shift is made by all colleges and universities in this regard, competition will be just as keen as before. However, the good players but underaverage students will have to seek elsewhere for involvement in sports. For example, they could elect to bring to bear the effort and persistence that made them great players and bring up their grades, thus meriting being a college athlete. Or they could seek immediate entry into professional sports. What they cannot do is allow themselves to be corrupted by those older individuals who have lost clarity of vision with respect to the university's mission.

Recommendations

Findings of the performed analysis yield a number of recommendations for action which Arizona State University can undertake to deal with the problems concerning the school's sports operation program. Most probably, most of the actions recommended will result in some initial loss of revenue, although there exist ways to minimize this loss which will be discussed more fully in the foregoing. The

actions recommended may be delineated as follows:

1. Set enrollment standards at a minimum of a B-average.

2. Set up committees of people not especially involved in sports to independently evaluate players' academic standing from time to time.

3. Do not hire coaches or other personnel who have been convicted of violations of NCAA rules except as in a functionary capacity.

4. Stop pressuring coaches and recruiters to win by giving them only short tenures so as to constantly re-evaluate them.

5. Provide courses wherein athletics is put in terms of the university's mission; i.e., the achievement of body is viewed not as a goal in itself but rather as an important goal because a sound, well performing body assists in maximizing those mental activities that are crucial for learning.

6. Make it clear through weekly or bimonthly meetings that any faculty or staff members involved in violations of any kind will be dealt with in terms of the university's maximum penalties.

7. Work to communicate better with investigative

bodies such as the NCAA and attempt to motivate such agencies toward bettering their practices of investigation.

8. Work up budgets independent of sports operation revenues for at least two years during which new practices and policies are being implemented. Also no matter whether revenues are or are not affected, do not allow the university to over-rely on funding accrued from sports operations.

9. For those inducements that can validly be given to athletes as a consequence of their enrollment in the university and participation in the sports program, set about creating special curricula to assist them in augmenting and honing the academic skills they do possess. This is important because being a good athlete takes a lot of time and effort and it is possible that even good students can suffer academic losses due to having to spend so much time and effort honing their athletic skills.

10. Use television and other media to repeatedly tout those players whose academic standing is high, thus rewarding them, the school, and all involved in emphasizing the school's mission.

11. Offer to booster organizations, educational packets which emphasize sports within the context of the university mission.

12. Use the media to tout what the university is doing in the way of stopping violations of NCAA standards. This can perhaps, to some degree, offset lost revenue by attracting funds and enrollments of those who respect the college's efforts and integrity.

13. Make penalties for violations stricter and attempt to devise ways in which penalties cannot be committed.

14. Provide publicity to those sports player alumni who maintained good or excellent GPA's during their college careers. These players could also be used in college ads and in films given to college players themselves to make them realize that doing well academically is as important as doing well on the playing field.

15. Open up channels of communication between booster oranizations and the university and work to strengthen these channels. Also utilize these channels to persistently remind these organizations that the university cannot and will not be cajoled, bribed, or threatened into placing winning at sports games above its mission of education and research. These channels should be further utilized to engage boosters into helping the school work toward convincing athletes that they must put forth their maximum efforts toward achieving academically and that this is a genuine part of their overall pursuits at college.

Many boosters have good relationships with faculty, staff, and players. By utilizing the channels of communication, the university may be able to convince some of these boosters to use their influence on players toward the goal of not only winning in sports but also in academic pursuits.

It should be understood that the recommendations set forth here are primarily guidelines for action. They are, essentially, moves to take toward a particular direction; and this direction is one of either assisting athletes to better their academic performance or of weeding them out of the school. What is important here is that regardless of what action might be taken, the primary focus must remain on maintaining the school's mission of education and research. It is only within the context of this mission that sports progrms can have positive impact upon the university, be it Arizona State University or any other college.

A P P E N D I X

Interview Questionnaire

This interview is a part of a practicum being conducted to assess the impact of major intercollegiate sports programs on the ability of Arizona State University to accomplish its mission. This interview is one of a number of such interviews of senior administrators at the university.

1. Do you have a favorable impression of the major intercollegiate sports programs conducted at ASU?

   _____ Yes _____ No

2. What justifies your impression, in your opinion?

   _____

   _____

3. What factors do you consider to be the principal strengths of ASU?

   _____

   _____

4. What factors do you consider to be the principal weaknesses of ASU?

   _____

   _____

5. What are the most significant opportunities, from your perspective, available to ASU in the external environment?

   _____

   _____

6. What are the most significant threats, from your perspective, to ASU in the external environment?

   _____

   _____

7. On balance, do you believe that major intercollegiate athletic programs at ASU are assets to the institution?

_____ Yes _____ No

8. What is the basis of that judgment?

_____

_____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amdur, N. (1981, March 29). Backers buy success and trouble for college athletic departments. New York Times, Section 1, p. 1.

Arizona State University. (1980). Arizona State University Intercollegiate Athletics Business Review June 30, 1974-80.

Davis, M. O. (1984). Colleges and universities vie for direct marketing. ZIP/Target Marketing, 7(6): 10-12.

Deregulating the NCAA. (1984). Fortune, (July 23): 6.

Longino, C. F. Jr. (1984). Migration winners and losers. American Demographics, 6(12): 27-45.

Lundberg, F. (1983). University-industry research partnerships. Journal of the Society of Research Administrators, 15(2): 35-38.

Murphy, J. C. (1986, December 12). Big time sports become the big risk: More universities need to realize the costs to education. Los Angeles Times, p. 7.

Nelson, J. (1986, December 21). Affluence, influence, and concern. Los Angeles Times, p. 1.

Rossini, F. A. (1984). Earthnet: The university of the future. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 26(2): 189-194.

Rowe, A. J., Mason, R. O., & Dickel, K. (1985). Strategic Management and Policy. (Second Edition) Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

United States Office of Education. (1985). Degree Granting Colleges and Universities. Wahsington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United Press International. (1981, January 27). Kush layer questions motive in suit. New York Times, Section B, p. 18.

United Press International. (1981, February 5). Cover-up is denied by Kush. New York Times, Section B. p. 10.

White, G. S. (1980, August 17). An undivided Pac-10 takes a firm stand. New York Times, Section 5, p. 1.

Williams, D. A. (1984). A buyers market: Too many colleges, too few students. Marketing News, 18(15): 14.